

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/802,354	03/16/2004	Laurence M. Shanley	F-8181	3618	
24131 LERNER GRE	7590 11/14/2007 EENBERG STEMER LL		EXAMINER		
P O BOX 2480			BOUCHELLE, LAURA A		
HOLLYWOO	D, FL 33022-2480		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3763		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		•	11/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

				^ 1	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
,		10/802,354 SHANLEY, LAURE		ENCE M.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Laura A. Bouchelle	3763		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addre	ess	
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DEPOSITION OF	DATE OF THIS COMMUN .136(a). In no event, however, may d will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mitte, cause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this comm ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)	Since this application is in condition for allowed	is action is non-final. ance except for formal ma	• •	nerits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	tion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.			
Applicat	tion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examing The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examing The specification is objected to be approximated to the specification is objected to by the Examing The specification is objected to be approximated to the specification is objected to the specification is ob	cepted or b) objected to objected to objected to objected to object of the drawing of the drawing of the drawing objection is required if the drawing objection is required if the drawing object.	vance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·			
12) <u>□</u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documer  Certified copies of the priority documer  Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Bures  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  nts have been received in ority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National St	age	
Attachme	nt(s)				
2) Not 3) Info	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) promation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) per No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	w Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application		

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Appeal brief filed 7/5/07 has been fully considered and subsequently the finality of the 1. previous action has been withdrawn. A new action on the merits follows.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cherif Cheikh (US 6896670). Cherif Cheikh discloses a safety injection device comprising a protective cap 22, a receiver 14, a needle 22, the protective cap completely encasing the needle and including a seal 24 that covers the opening of the protective cap (Col. 2, lines 63-65), the receiver being movable disposed in the protective cap for movement from a closed position to a functional position where the sharps element projects through a needle guide and from the protective cap.
- 4. Regarding claims 3, 8, Cherif Cheikh discloses a tab formed on the receiver to correspond with a groove on the protective cover. See Fig. 5.

Application/Control Number: 10/802,354 Page 3

Art Unit: 3763

5. Regarding claim 6, Cherif Cheikh discloses a membrane seal 24 covering and sealing the

opening when the needle is in the retracted position.

6. Regarding claim 9, the syringe has a plunger 30 and a barrel 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

8. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cherif Cheikh in view of Grabis et al (US 6322540). Claims 2, 5, 7 differ from Cherif Cheikh in

calling for the device to comprise a clip ring that limits the movement of the receiver and the

cap. Grabis teaches a safe needle device comprising a protective cover 7 and a clip ring 11 that

acts as a stop to prevent motion of the receiver past a certain point on the cover. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the

device of Cherif Cheikh to have a ring as taught by Grabis to prevent the cover from moving past

a certain position on the receiver.

9. Claims 10, 12, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cherif Cheikh in view of Grabis as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Lee et al (US

5201721). Claims 10, 12 differ from Cherif Cheikh in view of Grabis in calling for the barrel to

be formed with a luer lock and the needle and cap to be mounted on the luer lock. Lee teaches a

safety needle comprising a barrel having a luer lock and a needle and cap mounted on the barrel

Page 4

so that the device can be used with various sized syringe appliances (Col. 5, line 65 - Col. 6, line

10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to modify the device of Cherif Cheikh in view of Grabis to have a barrel with a luer

lock and a needle and cap mounted on the luer as taught by Lee so that the device can be used

with a number of different syringes.

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over lee in view of

Cherif Cheikh in view of Grabis as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Gregorio

(US 5346475). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cherif

Cheikh in view of Grabis in view of Lee in view of Gregorio. Claims 11, 13 differ from the

teachings above in calling for the cap to define at least two functional positions. Gregorio teaches

a syringe having a cap 28 that is capable of locking in multiple positions such that the needle

projects out of the front of the cap by varying amounts to provide varying injection depths.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

to modify the device above to include a cap capable of locking in more than one functional

position as taught by Gregorio so that the needle can project out of the front of the cap by

varying amounts.

Application/Control Number: 10/802,354

Art Unit: 3763

Response to Arguments

Page 5

11. Applicant's arguments, see appeal brief, filed 7/5/07, with respect to the rejection of

claims 1-15 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-15 has

been withdrawn.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Laura A. Bouchelle whose telephone number is 571-272-2125.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 517-272-4977. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI LEGALLON DEMINER SAUD

Examiner

Laura A Bouchelle

Art Unit 3763